



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/937,883	09/25/1997	SHIMON GRUPER	COLB-0083	2262

20741 7590 03/14/2002
HOFFMAN WASSON & GITLER
2361 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
SUITE 522
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

FOLLANSBEE, JOHN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2002

26

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/937,883

Applicant(s)

GRUPER ET AL.

Examiner

John Follansbee

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 19-23 are pending in the application.
2. The examiner is unable to get a copy of the copyright. The examiner maintains that the art of record submitted by Applicant (i.e., Secure4U) has a date of March 19, 1997. If Applicant disagrees, a statement, stating that March 19, 1997 is not the date of the Secure4U published document, will be sufficient to overcome the reference. The examiner feels that this disagreement must in writing and of record in this application.
3. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose (5,144,660) in view of Shane (5,793,972).

Art Unit: 2154

6. Rose shows the use of an apparatus for ensuring the integrity of computer applications to be run in association with a computer having data storage arranged sectorwise (i.e., disk) in a storage device, comprising:

apparatus for assigning a general enforcement file to each new program (i.e., defined write protected areas) (e.g. col. 4, lines 30-50);

apparatus for monitoring the program's attempt to make file accesses (i.e., col. 4, lines 30-50);

an enforcement device operative to treat attempts of the program to access files in the write-protected area as unacceptable (e.g. col. 4, lines 30-50).

Rose does not specifically show the use of a learning period. Rose does however state that virus program lie dormant and are triggered after a certain number of accesses, after a certain time, on a given date, or on some other trigger event (e.g. col. 1, lines 33-40). Shane shows the use of a learning period (i.e., number of acceptable unauthorized attempts within a predetermined period of time) (e.g. col. 10, lines 10-40) and denying access after the learning period (e.g. col. 10, lines 42-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shane with Rose because it would provide for a reduction in the amount of the time required for the execution of an applet. In most systems which use sandboxes the applet is compiled with redirection codes or every file access is checked. By not having to check every access attempt and not having to compile the code with redirection logic would provide for the applet to execute sooner on the browser.

Art Unit: 2154

7. As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore, Shane shows the use of not denying access until the threshold occurs (e.g. col. 10, lines 10-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shane with Rose because it would provide for a reduction in the amount of the time required for the execution of an applet.

8. As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore, Rose shows the use of prompting the user upon occurrence of an attempt of the program to access files not allowed to be accessed (e.g. col. 10, lines 10-40). "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for specific permission is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include specific permission to the combined system of Rose and Shane because it would provide for supervised control of unknown applets.

9. As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

10. The following prior art is made of record:

- a) Mueller et al. (6,351,816)
- b) Bond et al. (6,275,938)
- c) Bruwer (6,166,650)

Art Unit: 2154

d) Golan (5,974,549).

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Follansbee whose telephone number is (703) 305-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

John Follansbee

March 5, 2002.



**JOHN A. FOLLANSBEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**